

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are now in the application. By this Amendment, claim 1 has been amended. Support for the amendment to claim 1 is found at least at page 4, lines 13-15, of the specification. No new matter has been added.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies extended to Applicants' representative by Examiner Théodore and Examiner Johnson during the September 1, 2009 personal interview. The following remarks constitute Applicants separate Summary of the Substance of Interview.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 8-12, and 18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by GB 1 389 238 to Ciba-Geigy (hereinafter "GB '238").

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites spraying the at least one crosslinkable starting material and the at least one aldehyde into one another. As agreed during the September 1 interview, GB '238 fails to suggest this feature.

Claims 13 and 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by GB '238, or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over GB '238.

The Office Action asserts that the product suggested in GB '238 has a moisture content as claimed. However, for the reasons set forth above, GB '238 fails to suggest all of the features of independent claim 1.

Claims 3, 15, and 19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over GB '238 in view of US Patent No. 5,807,584 to Thiesse et al.

The Office Action relies on Thiesse for suggesting features corresponding to a nozzle having a diameter of from 1 μ m to 10 mm. Thiesse is not applied in a manner to cure the deficiencies of GB '238 discussed above.

Claims 4, 16, and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over GB '238 in view of US 5,269,980 to Levendis et al.

The Office Action relies on Levendis for suggesting a condensation reaction taking place in a drop of liquid. Levendis is not applied in a manner to cure the deficiencies of GB '238 discussed above.

Claims 6 and 7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over GB '238.

The Office Action asserts that it would have been obvious to optimize the pressure suggested in GB '238 to arrive at the claimed range. However, for the reasons set forth above, GB '238 fails to suggest all of the features of independent claim 1.

Claim 17 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over GB '238 in view of Thiesse and in further view of Levendis.

The Office Action relies on Levendis for suggesting producing particles of predictable shape and size. Thiesse and Levendis are not applied in a manner to cure the deficiencies of GB '238 discussed above.

Claims 2-20 are in condition for allowance for at least their respective dependence on an allowable claim 1, as well as for the separately patentable subject matter that each of these claims recites.

In view of the above amendment, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Applicants concurrently herewith submit the requisite fee for a Request for Continued Examination and a Petition for a one-month Extension of Time. Applicants believe no fee additional fee is due with this response. However, if any such additional fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 22-0185, under Order No. 12810-00129-US1 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: September 8, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature: /Georg M. Hasselmann/
Georg M. Hasselmann
Registration No.: 62,324
CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP
1875 Eye Street, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 331-7111
(202) 293-6229 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant